

## Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Transport and Infrastructure Committee: Minutes

Date: 12 January 2022

Time: 10.00am – 12.05pm

Present: Councillors Neil Gough, Peter Hiller, Jon Neish, Chris Seaton, Richard Robertson and Neil Shailer.

Apologies: Mayor Dr Nik Johnson and Councillor Katie Thornburrow, substituted by Councillor Richard Robertson

### 31. Apologies and declarations of interest

Apologies were received from Mayor Dr Nik Johnson and Councillor Katie Thornburrow, substituted by Councillor Richard Robertson.

### 32. Election of Chair for the Meeting

Due to the apologies for absence received from Mayor Dr Nik Johnson, it was necessary to elect a Chair for the meeting. It was proposed by Councillor Hiller, seconded by Councillor Seaton and agreed unanimously that Councillor Jon Neish be appointed as Chair for the meeting.

It was resolved:

To appoint Councillor Jon Neish be elected as Chair for the meeting

### 33. Minutes – 8 November 2021

The minutes of the meeting on 8 November 2021 were approved as an accurate record and signed by the Mayor.

### 34. Combined Authority Forward Plan – 3 December 2021

The Combined Authority Forward Plan was noted.

### 35. Public questions

One public question was received the response to which can be found at Appendix A to these minutes.

### 36. Fengate Access Study

The Committee received a report that provided an update on the works undertaken within the Fengate and was requesting the approval of £150,000 drawdown which would allow to complete the Full Business Case. The scheme sought to address congestion in the area that would also enable development to continue.

During discussion Members raised the following points:

- Emphasised the vital importance of the project for Peterborough. Fengate and Boongate needed improved accessibility to allow for future growth in the area and welcomed the proposed active travel provision through the Fengate area.
- Commented that the scheme was car orientated and that there was an opportunity to improve transport links such as buses. - The Director of Transport in response highlighted the area as a vital hub of employment and economic growth. The highway aspect and interconnectivity were the initial drivers for the project; however, work was ongoing to regarding active travel and the CPCA Bus Improvement Plan would also address such issues. It was vital that the investment was made in the business case to progress it to where it needed to be. It was essential that the area had the capacity to allow people to travel to and from their place of work and that business were able to conduct their business.
- Drew attention to the overlap with the University of Peterborough Access Scheme and received assurance from officers that the interdependencies between the two schemes were appreciated from a programme management perspective.
- Highlighted the role of the Parkway system in Peterborough and that it was one of the fastest commuter cities in the country.

It was proposed by the Cllr Hiller, seconded by Councillor Seaton and resolved unanimously to:

It was resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the drawdown of £150,000 to complete the Full Business Case stage of the project
- b) Approve the slippage of the remaining in-year subject to approval budget and note the need for a further reprofile exercise once the revised project timeframe is established in January.

### 37. Fengate Phase 2 University of Peterborough Access

The Committee received that summary of the findings of the Package Assessment Report- Outline Business Case Phase 1 as well as sought approval of the planned reprofile.

Commenting on the report Members:

- Expressed concern regarding the heavy car dependency of the scheme that did not include modal shift. There appeared to be no analysis of alternatives to roads and could be a missed opportunity to re-prioritise traffic. There could also be a risk that a scheme was being progressed that was out of date and potentially affect government funding. Officers explained that the CPCA had been engaged with Peterborough City Council and designers. Peterborough was a rapidly evolving city and the university will attract a large number of students. Historically the area was a that was historically a car friendly environment. The emphasis of the scheme was to ease access into the university area. The project began some years ago and would be reviewed in light of climate change commitments and active travel.
- Noted that the area was not saturated with cars and attention was drawn to the Green Wheel that represented 50 miles of cycling infrastructure in the city. All modes of travel were encouraged within the city.
- Drew attention to the wider area outside of the city which was rural. It would be very difficult to remove the car entirely as rural areas depended on it. The only way to address that would be to improve the number of opportunities for people to leave the car at home through additional rail and bus services.
- Commented that there was an opportunity to design a project around the needs of students and cited Anglia Ruskin University where a significant number of students travelled in from outlying areas and sought clarity on how that was being addressed. Officers highlighted the links and interdependencies of Fengate Phase 1 and 2. The scheme was not solely about accessing the university but the area as a whole and the management of modes of transport around the area. Connectivity to Peterborough linked to the Fenland stations regeneration programme and other CPCA schemes that would also benefit wider sustainable access.
- Suggested that the Committee review the university access to ensure the CPCA was catering to all users.

It was proposed by the Cllr Hiller, seconded by Councillor Seaton and resolved unanimously to:

- a) Approve the University of Peterborough Access Study Package Assessment Report – Outline Business Case Phase 1

- b) Approve the drawdown of £1.8m in respect of the costs associated with the Outline Business Case Phase 2, and to conclude a Grant Funding Agreement with Peterborough City Council on terms approved by the Head of Transport and Chief Legal Officer/Monitoring Officer
- c) Approve the submission of the updated application at appendix 2 to the Department of Transport's Major Route Network Programme fund

### 38. A10 Outline Business Case

The Committee received a report that sought approval to develop scope and to progress the delivery of the A10 Outline Business case. Presenting the report, officers informed the Committee that a bid had been presented to the Department for Transport (DfT) for the development of an Outline Business Case to understand whether an additional £2m of funding was required whether the project would require £2m of additional funding or would be a smaller package of work. The CPCA had ongoing engagement with Cambridgeshire County Council and DfT with regard moving the project forward.

During discussion Members raised the following points:

- Expressed concern regarding time scales and whether there was a risk that funding could be withheld or returned to the Department for Transport. Officers explained that swift progress was essential in order that a scope was delivered by the end of March 2022.
- Questioned the project as there was a rail line that ran alongside the A10 and improvements to bus services would improve congestion on the road significantly. It was therefore essential that the business case justified the need and purpose of the proposed improvements.
- Noted that funding was not solely for a dualling of the A10 and discussion would be taking place at Cambridgeshire County Council's Highways and Transport Committee regarding alternatives and options other than dualling. The corridor was extremely important for local people and the connectivity of communities along the route.
- Noted the ambition to provide a fully segregated cycle route between Ely and Cambridge.
- Recognised the high volumes of traffic that travelled along the A10 at peak times. It was also an area of high agricultural use with slow moving traffic. Officers were developing a business case that provided the appropriate solution for the area. There were several factors that required consideration such as the integration with current and proposed developments and analysis of traffic movements. The CPCA Bus Improvement Plan sought to improve the bus network and how to connect people that did not have access to the main bus and train routes.

- Expressed concern that the proposed cycle path alongside the A10 would not comply with recommended layout in certain places. Officers explained that the business case process would allow consideration of all aspects and provide assurance regarding such matters. There were particular areas along the route that posed difficulties. However, engineers would be challenged to overcome them.
- Noted that the current cycle path alongside the A10 was of particularly poor quality.

It was proposed by the Seaton, seconded by Councillor Gough and resolved unanimously to:

- a) Note the outputs of the Cambridgeshire County Council Highways and Infrastructure Committee paper
- b) Delegate authority to the Head of Transport, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer to develop the scope for the delivery of the Outline Business Case
- c) Approve the release of £2m funding from Department for Transport, to be spent in 22-23, for the delivery of the Outline Business Case, and agree reprofiling the remaining 21-22 budget into 22-23.
- d) Subject to an extension to the existing DfT grant being agreed, delegate authority to the Head of Transport, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer to issue a capital grant funding agreement for the delivery of the outline business case by Cambridgeshire County Council.

### 39. A141 Huntingdon and St Ives Strategic Outline Business Case

The Committee received a report that provided an introduction and update on the progress of the St Ives Study, explained the progress outcomes of the A141 and St Ives Strategic Outline Business Case and next steps.

During discussion of the report Members:

- Commented that the project was at a stage where it could be shaped significantly. All the options were for a road scheme together with other improvements. There was concern that by grouping the proposals together it was difficult to understand what the contribution or benefits of the component parts. There was no assessment of a non-road building option which prevented effective comparison.
- Noted that the large part of the surrounding area that had been designated for growth that would place increased pressure on all modes of transport. There were areas such as St Ives where traffic and congestion was a problem. There was also a need for increased affordable housing in the area. The proposals for improvements had been progressing for some time and time was critical and such pressures were building.

- Noted the comments of the Director of Transport that provided the background and context to the project. There were significant growth pressures in the area that had to be balanced with the need to protect the Great Ouse Valley that also exacerbated connectivity issues. It was evident from the work undertaken to date that a highway solution was necessary however, the project was not about encouraging cars but to address current issues and to encourage people onto different modes of transport. Control measures were in place during the development of the business case. Needs also differed between Huntingdon and St Ives despite clear interdependencies. There were also far more stringent policy requirements made of the design team when progressing to the next stage.

It was proposed by the Chair, seconded by Councillor Shailer and resolved unanimously/majority to:

- a) Note the St Ives study and progress
- b) Note the A141 and St Ives option appraisal report
- c) Note the A141 and St Ives Strategic Outline Business Case
- d) Recommend the Combined Authority Board approve the development and costing up of the next stage of the project for Outline Business Case and Preliminary design.
- e) Recommend the Combined Authority Board approve the programme for, and costing up of, the Local Improvement schemes for St Ives

#### 40. Local Transport and Connectivity Plan Update

The Committee received a report detailing the outputs of the soft launch public engagement and provided a verbal update on progress toward the formal consultation. The presenting officer drew the attention of the Committee to a slight error contained within the report at page 1 where a reference to October consultation and should have been November.

During discussion Members raised the following points:

- Drew attention to the contrast between the results of the consultation and the proposed works in Peterborough.
- Highlighted the priority in Cambridge to reduce congestion within the city and made the link to bus routes and timetabling. It was essential that the priorities followed the public's wishes.
- Clarified the timetable for the next steps and noted that further discussion would take place with leaders regarding the timeframe. Officers explained that the work undertaken on the LTCP may constitute a rewrite rather than a refresh and therefore the next stage of consultation would be for 12 weeks rather than 6.

- Noted the extensive engagement the CPCA had committed to, and the feedback received. The review of the feedback had resulted in pressure on the team in terms of reviewing the feedback and the potential legislative requirements associated with a refresh or a rewrite of the LTCP.

It was resolved to:

Note the outputs of the October Soft Launch public engagement

#### 41. Budget and Performance Update

The Committee received the January Budget and Performance Update report which presented the progress to date made against budgets set in January 2021. It included the summary of the year-to-date transport revenue budget; the RAG risk rating; statistics from the Five-Year Gateway Review results; and an expenditure timetable for the 2021-22 budget.

During discussion of the report Members:

- Sought an update regarding Coldhams Lane, Cambridge. Officers explained that Cambridgeshire County Council had undertaken budget prioritisation, further discussions with the Council would need to take place and a decision taken on whether a report should be presented to the Committee.
- Drew attention to data contained within the report relating to road traffic collision fatalities that was somewhat dated. Officers explained that there was significant lag in the data owing to the nature of the returns made to the Government and would be updated as soon as possible.
- Noted that the process relating to invoicing and that the budget forecast was accurate.
- Noted the update provided regarding Wisbech Rail. It was anticipated that following of receipt of the latest report from Network Rail a report would be presented to the March meeting of the Committee.

It was resolved to:

Note the January Budget and Performance Monitoring Update.

#### 42. Date of next meeting

It was resolved to note the date of the next Transport and Infrastructure Committee would be 14<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

Mayor

Public question from Mr Sean Finley.

Question

Can we ensure that a bridge for walkers, cyclists etc is included in the plans for the Broadend road roundabout?

Response

There is no segregated walking, cycling provision within the current design which is being finalised for potential future funding availability. It is noted however that segregated cycling and walking should be considered if and when funding becomes available and the current design is reviewed prior to construction.